

## REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed December 22, 2004, the Examiner noted that claims 1-10 were pending, and rejected claims 1-10. Claims 1 and 5-10 have been amended, new claims 11 and 12 have been added and, thus, in view of the forgoing claims 1-12 remain pending for reconsideration which is requested. No new matter has been added. The Examiner's rejections are traversed below.

In the Office Action the Examiner rejected claims 7 under 35 U.S.C. section 112 paragraph 2 as indefinite and rejected claims 7-9 under 35 U.S.C. section 101 as non-statutory. The claims have been amended in consideration of the Examiner's comments and it is submitted they satisfy the requirements of the statute. If additional concerns with the claims arise, the Examiner is invited to telephone to resolve the same. Suggestions by the Examiner are also welcome. Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Starting on page 3 of the Office Action rejects all claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Nishino and Otsu.

Both Nishino and Otsu discuss calculating intensity of an electromagnetic field of an electronic circuit device and both use a moment method for calculating mutual impedance (see Nishino at col. 10, line 46 and Otsu Abstract). In both of these cases, the calculations assumed that there is a variable interaction between any pair of objects.

In contrast, the present invention does not make the above-noted assumption and essentially negates the variable interaction between mutually distant objects. By doing so the calculation process speed can be improved. The present claimed invention emphasizes this separation by setting the current values of the radio wave generation source as "constants" based on the premise that for distant objects where interaction is slight it is possible to assume the electric currents of the wave source to be constant. The present claimed invention also emphasizes this separation by performing the calculations separately ("separately calculated"). By setting the currents to constants, it becomes possible to handle the wave source separately from a signal receiving object, that is, handle the simultaneous equations for the source separately and independently from those for the receiving object.

The prior art of Nishino and Otsu does not teach or suggest such.

It is submitted that the invention of independent claims distinguishes over the prior art and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

The dependent claims depend from the above-discussed independent claims and are patentable over the prior art for the reasons discussed above.

New claim 11 and 12 also emphasize the separate calculation and the use of constants as features of the present invention as discussed above. Claim 12 emphasizes doing so when the relative positions of the object and source change. Nothing in the prior art teaches or suggests such. It is submitted that these new claims, which are different and not narrower than prior filed claims distinguishes over the prior art.

It is submitted that the claims satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. sections 101 and 112. It is further submitted that the claims are not taught, disclosed or suggested by the prior art. The claims are therefore in a condition suitable for allowance. An early Notice of Allowance is requested.

If any further fees, other than and except for the issue fee, are necessary with respect to this paper, the U.S.P.T.O. is requested to obtain the same from deposit account number 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date:

3/22/15

By:



J. Randall Beckers  
Registration No. 30,358

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501